



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

(101) Luciani mortuorum dialogi; (102) Pererius in Daniele, 1602, Lugd.; (106) Kekkermanni Logica; (107) Munstri Gramm. Ebr. Eliae Levitae; (108) Pinto Delgado Poema de la Reyna Ester; (112) Grotius de Imperio Summarum Potestatum circa Sacra; (115) El Criticon vol. 3 [by Balthasar Gracian]; (118) Ben Israel Esparanca (!) de Israel; (121) Klanbergh's uytbreiding van Descartes; (125) Logique ou l'art de penser [the Port-Royal]; (127) Clanbergii Logica; (128) Senecae Epistolae; (129) Hobbes Elementa Philosophica [De Cive]; (130) Clapmarius de arcanis Rerum pp.; (136) Plinii Secundi Epistolae cum Panegyrico; (141) Verulamii Sermones fideles [Bacon's Essays]; (147) Petrarcha de Vita Solitaria; (148) Justinianus; (149) Velthusius de Usu rationis in Theologia.

One of the most interesting "finds" of Prof. Freudenthal consists of an entry in the Synagogue accounts showing that on Dec. 5, 1655, Spinoza made an offering in the Synagogue. This clearly refutes Meinsma's view that Spinoza had separated himself from his co-religionists long before he was anathematized (July, 1656).

The results of Prof. Freudenthal's labours should prove both interesting and fruitful. The lives of very few philosophers engage so much interest as does the life of Spinoza. For "the life of Spinoza reveals a harmony of conviction, theory, and practice, such as the history of philosophy but rarely exhibits. It is . . . at once the fountain and mirror of his teaching."

A. WOLF.

## PROFESSOR ROBERTSON ON THE PSALMS.

*The Poetry and Religion of the Psalms*, by JAMES ROBERTSON, D.D.,  
Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Glasgow.  
(William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1898.)

IN 1893-1894 Professor Robertson of Glasgow was the Croall Lecturer, and selected as his subject the Place of the Psalms in the History and Religion of the Old Testament. The volume which he has now published contains the substance of the Lectures then delivered; the material, however, is re-arranged, and notice has been taken of some of the literature that has appeared in the interval between the delivery and the publication of the lectures.

The earlier title indicates the scope of these Lectures better than that under which they are now published. It is those aspects of the

religion and poetry of the Psalms that help to determine their origin and history which are here discussed; and a considerable part of the lectures is devoted to matters which are concerned with neither the poetry nor the religion of the Psalms, but which are very relevant to the question as to what place the Psalms occupy in the religion and history of the Old Testament.

In the first and introductory chapter Prof. Robertson briefly, but admirably, indicates the place of the Psalms in relation to religion in general and more particularly in relation to the religion of the Old Testament. "In the Law and the Prophets we have God's call to man, characterized, in the former, by a system of rules to be observed in the life, in the latter by the enforcement of eternal principles on which God's claim to man's obedience is rested. In the second place come the Psalms, which are the expression of man's religious feelings in their struggle to reach God and to find peace . . . And lastly, we have what is called the Wisdom literature, the nearest approach which the Old Testament exhibits to philosophizing or speculation," pp. 2 f. Again, speaking of "the religion of the Old Testament, as a thing attained" reaching "its culmination in the Psalms," he says, "Religion, from our present point of view, is not a speculative but an active thing; Scripture is not so much an embodiment of so many truths made known for man's instruction, as a record of a movement of man's spirit by the spirit of God for a practical end, man's salvation." In an unparalleled manner the Psalms show us revealed Truth at work in the hearts of men: the unique influence of these poems lies not at all in the novelty of the truths that form their subjects but in the intensity of conviction with which these truths are held and uttered, in the vivid apprehension of things unseen, in their life-begetting trust and hope and faith. The expressions of despondency bordering at times on despair, the questioning of God's ways which are also in them, serve only to throw into greater relief the unconquerable faith in a living God, which is their most essential characteristic.

All this Prof. Robertson appreciates, and portrays so well, that many will share his regret that he has felt himself compelled to handle his subject in a controversial manner. Personally, I feel this regret the more deeply on two grounds: Prof. Robertson appears to me almost wholly unsuccessful in his attack on the positions he controverts; and the exigencies of controversy have in several cases led to a one-sided presentation of important matters which must prove misleading to many of the more general readers for whom especially Prof. Robertson writes.

The two positions which Prof. Robertson sets himself to challenge

are these: (1) that the Psalter is a product of post-exilic Judaism; (2) that the "I" of the Psalms spoken in the first person singular is a personification. Prof. Robertson of course admits that there are post-exilic Psalms, and that the "I" is sometimes (e. g. Psalm cxxix) a personification. But he denies the universality of either of the above statements; or rather, in the case of the first—to be strictly accurate—he denies the legitimacy of affirming it universally. For throughout the volume he never attempts to prove that any Psalm is pre-exilic, but simply that some may be (cf. pp. 17 f.). Now this is very significant; for the proposition "all Psalms are post-exilic" can only be satisfactorily disproved by showing that a single particular Psalm is not post-exilic. Since Prof. Robertson has not adopted this simple line of argument, we may infer that he does not feel sure about the pre-exilic origin of any Psalm in particular. But in this case he is in much closer agreement with the general trend of critical opinion than he seems to realize. Very few scholars would assert the above proposition. What is at least very generally meant by the statement that the Psalter is the product of the post-exilic period is this: that the great majority of the Psalms *in their present form* are the work of that period, and that the various processes of Psalm collection which preceded the ultimate editing of the Psalter fall within the same period. In other words, the Psalter is a collection of sacred poems made in the post-exilic period; it consists of several prior collections which were also made within this period; many of the individual poems are also proved to have been of exilic or post-exilic origin by language (e. g. Psalm cxxxix—so Prof. Robertson, p. 63) or historical allusion (e. g. Psalm cxxvii, p. 121) or otherwise. In view of these facts sound historical method must continue to demand proof positive before any particular Psalm in this post-exilic collection can be used as evidence of pre-exilic religion. The utmost Prof. Robertson attempts is to furnish proof presumptive that some Psalms, without specifying which, may be pre-exilic. But in this he is not at variance with many whose opinions he seems to controvert. The probability that Psalms were written before the exile, the possibility that some of these survive—probably somewhat modified—in the Psalter is generally admitted.

I will now refer to certain details in Prof. Robertson's arguments.

And first as to certain matters in which I find myself in complete agreement with him. (1) Prof. Robertson states what has now become a matter of general agreement when he says: "It is evident . . . that we cannot accept the inscriptions as authoritative or reliable indications of the authorship and occasions of composition of the Psalms to which they are attached" (p. 47). (2) In his scepticism

as to the possibility of determining from internal evidence the particular occasions which gave rise to particular Psalms (p. 50), I fully share. This healthy scepticism, which, if we may judge from many recent works on the Psalms, still needs to become more prevalent, is due more particularly to De Wette and Hupfeld; the latter rendered a very decided service to the criticism of the Psalms by his method, alluded to by Prof. Robertson in his sketch of the history of the criticism (chap. II). of setting side by side the occasions, sometimes ranging over all periods of Hebrew history, selected by different writers, on equally unsubstantial grounds, for the origin of individual Psalms. But in one respect we have advanced since Hupfeld's day. The correct appreciation of the real historical value of the titles enables us to determine the *terminus ad quem* of many of the Psalms. It is remarkable that Prof. Robertson takes no notice in chap. II of Robertson-Smith's masterly discussion of this point. The appreciation of the true significance of the titles, which is nowhere more lucidly set forth than in that discussion, marks the most considerable advance in the criticism of the Psalms since Hupfeld. And what makes it the more remarkable that Prof. Robertson has so largely overlooked this line of evidence is the fact that, so far as it goes, it points to conservative conclusions—or to state the matter more neutrally—to an earlier origin of certain Psalms than could be positively deduced either from internal evidence or from the fact that they form part of the Psalter. For example, internal evidence has been held by scholars of very different schools to point to the Maccabæan origin of Psalms xlv, lxxiv, lxxix; and unquestionably these Psalms would be quite intelligible in the light of the circumstances of that period. But forming, as they do, part of the twofold (Korah-Asaph) Levitical collection, they must belong to a considerably earlier period (ante c. 300 B. C.). Except by refusing altogether to admit the evidence of the titles this conclusion can only be avoided with great difficulty and little probability (cf. Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 270-273). (3) Prof. Robertson is quite right in pointing out that conclusions relative to the Psalms depend on many prior conclusions as to the history, literature, and religion of Israel. Of course no careful student of the Psalter needs to be told this; and the dependence of the criticism of the Psalms on Old Testament criticism in general has been frequently and clearly insisted on, particularly by Canon Cheyne. It is the obvious consequence of the marked absence from the Psalms of clear allusions to decisive political events. Of necessity one is thrown back on literary affinities and religious ideas as criteria for the periods in which the Psalms originated; and these of course

must speak differently to those whose views of the history of Hebrew literature and Hebrew religion widely differ.

It is this that makes it particularly difficult to come to close quarters with Prof. Robertson. For he has nowhere clearly indicated his position with regard to many of the questions which vitally affect the criticism of the Psalms. All therefore that will be attempted here is to refer to one or two cases in which, even admitting the correctness of his own positions as far as they can be discovered, his argument seems based on very insecure foundations.

The main argument of the book may be summarized thus: (*a*) there must have been pre-exilic Psalms; (*b*) they cannot all have perished; therefore (*c*) some survive. Now in favour of (*a*) many weighty considerations can be adduced, without quite so much use of the Chronicler as Prof. Robertson makes. The extreme probability of pre-exilic Psalms is a matter of general admission; and, therefore, it is not worth while to discriminate here between what is cogent and what must, to many, lack cogency in Prof. Robertson's argument for this position. It is certainly *a priori* probable that, if there were many pre-exilic psalms, some survived; but Prof. Robertson (e.g. pp. 184 ff.) rhetorically exaggerates the improbability that with few or no exceptions they have not survived. There can be no question that a great mass of early Hebrew poetry has perished (so Prof. Robertson, p. 324). The only sure way to prove that some pre-exilic psalms have survived is to prove that some single, particular psalm is pre-exilic. Winckler<sup>1</sup> has just expressed his confidence that Psalm xxii can be shown by internal evidence to contain the prayer of Manasseh. If he be right, we should have a specimen of pre-exilic psalmody from which to work. Prof. Robertson is less bold; he contents himself with saying that the author of Psalms iii and iv "may have been David himself" (pp. 279, 345), that Psalms *like* (but how much like?) lxxviii, cv, cvi, must have been composed before the exile. All this, however, only gives us quite uncertain—because merely possible or approximate—standards of early psalmody. But Prof. Robertson seeks to minimize the uncertainty in which he himself is left by the internal evidence. He lays stress on a certain kind of external evidence, viz. the presence of Psalms in some of the historical and prophetic books. It is here that, though to the superficial reader he may seem to make points against his opponents, he is really on very weak ground. He asserts again and again that the advocates of the late origin of the Psalms, in order to avoid this evidence that the Psalms in question were pre-exilic, pronounce them to be interpolations (see e.g. pp. 147 f., 184 f., 323 f.). Now, to take the case of

<sup>1</sup> *Altorientalische Forschungen*, Zweite Reihe, I, pp. 172-181.

the prophetic books, which is simplest, first, what are the facts? The collection of prophetic writings in the form in which we now possess them is certainly post-exilic, as Prof. Robertson would admit. Further, the two books entitled respectively Isaiah and "the Twelve" are themselves post-exilic, for the latter includes the post-exilic prophecies of Haggai, Zechariah, and "Malachi"; and the former, prophecies which Prof. Robertson would probably not deny to have been written in the last years of the exile. What then, does the ascription of a poem, e.g. to Habakkuk, in such a collection prove? Simply this, that at some time prior to c. 300-200 B. C., when the prophetic canon was closed, the tradition that the poem in question was the work of such an author was already current. There is no necessity to assume anything that can, with any regard for language, be termed "interpolation." What could have been more natural than for the editor of "the Twelve" to append to the prophecies of Habakkuk the poem that passed under his name? The psalm in Habakkuk is not therefore "interpolated," its presence in the Book of the Twelve proves not that it is the work of Habakkuk, but simply that as early as c. 300-200 B. C. it already passed under his name; just as the Greek titles of Psalms cxlvi (cxlv)-cxlviii prove that by about 100 B. C. these four Psalms were attributed to Haggai and Zechariah; from which, however, it by no means follows that these, or indeed any other psalms, were actually composed by these two prophets.

"Interpolation" more accurately describes the process by which Psalm xviii came into the books of Samuel; but Prof. Robertson is wrong in concluding that the Psalm is pronounced an interpolation because it is a Psalm. The real reason for regarding chs. xx-xxiv (not merely the Psalms contained in them) to be an interpolation in 2 Samuel may be found briefly indicated in Dr. Driver's *Introduction*<sup>6</sup>, p. 183. Those reasons may be unconvincing to Prof. Robertson. But to those who admit their force, it necessarily follows that the position of Psalm xviii in 2 Samuel proves simply that at some time in the post-exilic period the Psalm was attributed to David. In other words, the fact that Psalm xviii stands where it does in 2 Samuel adds nothing to what may be inferred from its position in what is admittedly the earliest extant collection of Psalms ("the first Davidic collection").

The fact that conclusions as to the origin of the Psalms must depend on prior conclusions as to the origin of much of the remainder of the Old Testament literature and the history of Hebrew religion, renders it fruitless to discuss in any detail Prof. Robertson's treatment of strictly internal evidence. For Prof. Robertson's prior conclusions

are nowhere clearly stated. Certainly if we may judge of David's religious belief by the saying attributed to him 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, we may safely deny, on the sole ground of the ideas contained in it, that Psalm cxxxix was written by David. But we have no right to do so, if we consider, as it is possible but by no means probable that Prof. Robertson does, the chronicler's account of that monarch to be the true historical one.

With the same strong conviction that Prof. Robertson still maintains that there must have been pre-exilic Psalms, and that, therefore, some of the extant Psalms are likely to be pre-exilic, I set myself a few years ago to a special investigation of the references to the king in the Psalter<sup>1</sup>. I expected in the Psalms containing these references to find some sure pre-exilic specimens, and so to gain an advantageous standpoint for determining the dates of other Psalms. I was disappointed of my expectation, and was driven to the conclusion that in at least the great majority of cases the king referred to was not an actual living person contemporary with the writer of the Psalm, but an ideal: briefly, that the king was Messianic. Prof. Robertson also concludes that "in the kingly Psalms the idealizing tendency of the psalmists attains freest scope" (p. 225: cf. pp. 225-232); and this leaves him with the merely hypothetical position that "if, as the vividness of the description indicates, they were composed when some individual representative of the line was on the throne, they must belong to the time of the monarchy." It will, I expect, be very generally felt that this is perilously weak evidence for a pre-exilic date of the Psalms in question.

On the whole, it seems probable that Prof. Robertson's book may have an influence contrary to that which he desires. Those who read it with any discernment will perceive that the author has an almost passionate desire to prove some of our Psalms pre-exilic, because, however mistakenly, he considers such a conclusion necessary to a continued belief in the worthiness of Hebrew religion; at the same time they will see that his love of truth prevents him from ever claiming that the evidence is sufficient to prove that any particular Psalm is pre-exilic. It will be natural and reasonable if such readers conclude that while the extant Psalms were a potent force in post-exilic religion, they cannot be proved to have been written before the exile, and therefore cannot be safely used in proof of the character of pre-exilic religion.

Only a few brief remarks can be made with regard to Professor Robertson's treatment of the collective "I" of the Psalter (ch. xi).

<sup>1</sup> JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VII, pp. 658-686.



It suffers very much in the same way as his discussion concerning the dates of the Psalms. Prof. Robertson deals with individual Psalms too little. It must be remembered that the large use in the Old Testament of that particular form of personification by which a nation or group of persons is spoken of as an individual is beyond dispute (so Prof. Robertson, p. 291); it is also beyond dispute that it is found in the Psalter (see Psalm cxxix). What is wanted is a determination, in particular cases, whether this personification is present or not. We may agree with Prof. Robertson that Smend is sometimes, or even often, extreme in his assumption of its presence; but it may be safely said that the ordinary reader will fail in innumerable cases to observe it, thereby missing the clue to the correct understanding of the Psalm, unless he receives more help than Prof. Robertson gives him.

Prof. Robertson does not discuss at all a particular instance of personification, to the existence of which I drew attention in the article already referred to. No doubt he would deny its existence, and regard my suggestion as an extreme development of the personification theory. I take this opportunity, however, of recalling attention to the matter, because in the four years that have elapsed since the article was published no one, so far as I am aware, has really disputed or disproved the applicability of my theory to some of the Psalms concerned; while some scholars have, to a greater or less extent, approved it. What I attempted to prove was that the king, in at least some of the "royal Psalms," was "no individual, contemporary or future, but the people of Jehovah as a whole, regarded as representatives to the world at large of Yahweh's sovereign power." To some extent, so far as Psalm ii was concerned, I had been anticipated in this view by Beer<sup>1</sup>, though my conclusions were reached quite independently of him. Prof. Oort<sup>2</sup>, in expressing general agreement with my position, indicates that he had in some measure reached it himself long ago independently. Prof. Driver<sup>3</sup>, while pronouncing it "difficult to think that the 'king' in Psalms xxi, lxi, lxiii, lxxii" can be taken as I suggested, appears to admit at least the possibility of my interpretation in some of the other

<sup>1</sup> *Individual- u. Gemeinde-Psalmen*, pp. 2 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, XXX, pp. 106 f.; cf. XXXII, p. 330. Prof. Oort draws attention to the support given to the theory that in some cases "the king" is a term for the "royal nation" of Israel, by the fact that the people as a whole, and not an individual, is sometimes called Messiah. See especially Ps. xxviii. 8, 9; cf. Psalms lxxxiv, cxxxii.

<sup>3</sup> *Introd.*<sup>6</sup>, p. 385 footnote.

Psalms. Prof. Cheyne, in his latest work<sup>1</sup>, approximates very closely to my view, even, and indeed mostly, in the case of Psalm xxi. He there writes as follows: "It is true that phrases like those in the last two lines of Psalm xvi are used in Psalm xxi of an earthly king. But who is that earthly king? Not any historically known king of Israel, but the expected Messianic king, who is, in fact, but the leader and representative of the community, so that what is said of him can equally well be said of personified Israel, and even (at least to a great extent) of each pious Israelite." In his discussion of the other "royal Psalms" (pp. 104-113), he is, too, in agreement with me; though he more than once draws attention to the vague and indistinct individuality of the king; thus of the "Davidic king who speaks in" Psalm xviii he says, "He has no private ambitions, and can therefore interpret the thoughts of the community: indeed, the psalmist sometimes forgets the king, and speaks for the personified people" (p. 111). German scholars, so far as I have observed, appear to be unacquainted with my article: but Weinel<sup>2</sup>, following up suggestions of Hitzig, Smend, Stade, and others, has reached conclusions similar to my own, especially in regard to Psalms ii and xviii.

It would be out of place here to argue my theory of interpretation afresh; but seeing that, if it be in any case applicable, it has important bearings not only on the dates of the Psalms, but also on the history and character of Messianic belief, I may hope to be excused for drawing attention to the extent to which it has gained approval since it was put forward, and to express my regret that Prof. Robertson, in his discussion of the "I" of the Psalter, has entirely overlooked it.

It is largely when we come to discuss such a question as the foregoing, or, to refer to another, the belief in individual immortality, that the determination of the extent to which personification is carried in the Psalter becomes really important. But Professor Robertson fails to help us in these matters. On the other hand, he very rightly insists—though with the assumption of opposition which is probably almost entirely imaginary—that personal and individual religious experience lies behind even the Psalms that express the hopes and feelings of the community (pp. 283 ff.). Much, of course, that was true of the community, must have been first realized in the experience of the individual. On the other hand, some things might be hoped for the community which were not hoped for the individual; and

<sup>1</sup> *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> In his article *כשיח* und seine Derivate in *ZATW.* 1898, see especially pp. 69-79.

of these immortality may be taken as a crucial example. And again, some things might be said of the nation, which were not, at least so readily, said of the individual. Israel was Yahwè's "son" (Hos. xi. 1): but did the individual Israelite so regard himself?

The fact is, Prof. Robertson gives too much weight to Smend's claim that the Psalter was the hymn-book of the second Temple. Putting that claim entirely out of sight, we are still left with the exegetical problem—How far does personification in our Psalter extend? We cannot escape the discussion, for personification is indisputably there (Psalm cxxix), and it would be manifestly absurd to limit its presence to the single Psalm, in which, by a happy chance, the peculiar rhythmic structure of the poem gives the author of the poem an opportunity for stating directly that he is personifying Israel (v. 1 b). A careful study of the Book of Lamentations will be found to be as good a preparation as any for approaching this difficult but important exegetical problem of the Psalter.

That the titles imply an individualistic interpretation does not prove that the original meaning of the Psalm was individualistic. For we have many instances of writers individualizing manifestly general expressions. The "son" whom Yahwè called out of Egypt was unquestionably to Hosea the whole people of Israel: but the author of the first Gospel interprets the expression of Jesus (Matt. ii. 15); and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 5-9) individualizes the purely general subject of the statements in Psalm viii. 5 f.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

## NOTES ON PROF. JASTROW'S EDITION OF HAYYÛĠ.

GOETHE's saying that "old age possesses what youth wishes for" is, in all its true and melancholy significance, applicable to our study of Hebrew grammatical research during the Middle Ages. That which was eagerly wished for in that direction in the forties of the present century, when that study was still in its infancy, has been supplied in rich abundance during the two last decades. The works of the greatest master of the classical period of that branch of learning, Abulwalid Mervân Ibn Ganach, or at least so much of them as is still extant, are accessible to all, partly in the original Arabic, partly in Hebrew translations. And another work also, which was written towards the end of the tenth century, and which became the basis of a future grammatical science of the Hebrew